

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	Page
1.1 The particles that comprise the Standard Model are arranged into three generations and the interactions between them are communicated by the exchange of the force carrying particles.	6
1.2 Schematic of the Higgs potential energy demonstrating how the particles of the SM obtain their mass.	9
1.3 An example of the one-loop quantum corrections from fermion loops (top quark shown here) to the Higgs mass leads that lead to a divergent Higgs boson mass without “fine tuning” in the theory. This is known as the “hierarchy” problem and presents a compelling reason to believe that the SM Higgs may not be the complete theory of EWK symmetry breaking.	10
1.4 The particles of the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) extension to the SM of particle physics.	13
1.5 One-loop quantum corrections to the Higgs mass leads to a divergent mass in the theory known as the “hierarchy” problem. In SUSY extensions to the SM the quantum corrections for fermions and their bosonic “SUSY-partners” have opposite signs and thus can lead to a cancellation that prevents the Higgs mass from becoming divergent.	14
1.6 Schematic of Gauge Mediated Supersymmetry Breaking (GMSB).	17
1.7 A schematic of production of long-lived $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ at the Tevatron decaying to a Gravitino (\tilde{G}) and a photon (γ) inside the CDF detector with the photon arriving with a delayed time.	24
1.8 Two example Feynmann diagrams illustrating SUSY $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ pair production event that, in the simplest GMSB models, can produce one or more photons + \cancel{E}_T in high energy particle collisions.	26
1.9 The predicted and observed exclusion regions from the ALEPH detector at LEP as well as the previous GMSB photon searches at CDF. The green shaded bands shows the cosmologically favored region where $0.5 < m_{\tilde{G}} < 1.5 \text{ keV}/c^2$ [40].	28

- 1.10 The predicted cross section and the 95% confidence limit expected and observed exclusion limit as a function of Λ from a search in $\gamma\gamma + \cancel{E}_T$ performed at the $D\bar{O}$ experiment in 2010. This search assumes SPS-8 model parameters and thus makes the dominant production of SUSY particles gaugino pair production. The corresponding masses are shown for the lightest chargino χ_1^\pm and neutralino χ_1^0 [41]. 29
- 1.11 The observed exclusion regions from a GMSB search performed at the LHC in 2011 for lifetimes up to ~ 3 ns for neutralino mass > 200 GeV/c² with 200 pb⁻¹ of data. This search assumes SPS-8 model parameters which are dominated by squark-gluino production. This result extends the previous search performed at the Tevatron and LEP for low lifetime neutralinos in this scenario. 30
- 1.12 Monte Carlo example of the corrected time variable, t_{corr} , for both promptly produced photons (LHS) as well as photons from a simulated long-lived $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ (RHS). 32
- 1.13 (LHS) Schematic showing how selecting a incorrect vertex (i.e. wrong vertex) can cause an errant calculation of the time-of-flight ($\frac{|\vec{x}_f - \vec{x}_i|}{c}$) thus leading to a t_{corr} described by a (RHS) Gaussian with an RMS ≈ 2 ns for wrong vertices. 33
- 1.14 A toy simulation of t_{corr} including GMSB signal events along with a set of collision and non-collision background events. Here the right vertex (blue), wrong vertex (red), and cosmic ray (yellow) distributions are shown. 34
- 1.15 The result of a preliminary search for delayed photons performed in 2008 in the exclusive $\gamma + \cancel{E}_T$ final state showing an excess of events in the region $2 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < 7 \text{ ns}$ above simple background estimation techniques. . . . 36

FIGURE

Page

1.16	The t_{corr} distribution for a pure sample of SM $W \rightarrow e\nu \rightarrow e + \cancel{E}_T$ events in data where we ignore the electron track and allow the algorithms to pick the highest ΣP_T vertex. In this case, the wrong vertex is often selected and we see the timing distribution as being the sum of right vertex and wrong vertex events. In the top plot we show a fit to the data in the region $-7 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < 2 \text{ ns}$ where we assume $\langle t_{corr}^{WV} \rangle = 0 \text{ ns}$. We can see that this is clearly not a good description of the data. The bottom plot shows the fit when we fit over the entire timing distribution and allow $\langle t_{corr}^{WV} \rangle$ to float in the fit. The agreement between the data and the double Gaussian prediction is excellent.	39
2.1	Overview of the Tevatron accelerator complex.	45
2.2	Isometric (top) view and elevation (bottom) view of the CDF detector. .	47
2.3	A 1/6 section of the Central Outer Tracker (COT). The COT has eight concentric “superlayers” separated in ϕ into “supercells”, with each containing 12 sense wires between field sheets. For each “superlayer” the total number of “supercells”, the wire orientation (axial or stereo), as well as the average radius is given in centimeters.	51
2.4	(Top) A schematic drawing of the Central ElectroMagnetic calorimeter (CEM) including the (Bottom) Central Electron Strips (CES) sub-detector showing the strips and wires.	54
2.5	(Top) A schematic view of the signal processing in the EMTiming system. (Bottom) A diagram demonstrating how the energy and timing measurement of a particle that showers in the calorimeter is made using the light obtained from the PMT.	55
2.6	(Top) Data flow diagram of the deadtimeless trigger and Data Acquisition (DAQ) system at CDF [53].	58
3.1	Monte Carlo simulation of a shift in the mean of our wrong vertex timing distribution that can cause an excess in the ratio of the number of events in the signal region ($2 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < 7 \text{ ns}$) to number of events in the control region ($-7 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < -2 \text{ ns}$).	77

- 3.2 A calculation of how a shift in the mean of the wrong vertex timing distribution, $\langle t_{corr}^{WV} \rangle$, can change the ratio of the number of events in the timing region $2 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < 7 \text{ ns}$ (Signal Region) to number of events in the timing region $-7 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < -2 \text{ ns}$ (Control Region) for a sample of SM collision events. The nominal ratio of one for a wrong vertex mean of 0.0 ns shown by the dashed black line. The blue line demonstrates that a value of $\langle t_{corr}^{WV} \rangle = 0.5$ gives you twice as many events in the signal region from SM sources than in the control region. The solid green lines indicate the desired tolerance, 100 ps , on systematic variations in $\langle t_{corr}^{WV} \rangle$. This tolerance was chosen because a shift of 100 ps $\langle t_{corr}^{WV} \rangle$ has less than a 10% effect in terms of an artificial “excess” or “deficit” of events expected in the signal region. 78
- 3.3 The ΔT between the electron track and the vertex, ΔT vs. electron η , ΔT vs. electron ϕ , and the ΔZ between the electron track and the vertex before calibrations. Note that they are not centered at zero, demonstrating the need for further timing calibrations. Note that despite the timing bias, these figures show that the required matching requirements, listed in Table 3.1, are very efficient. 84
- 3.4 (LHS) The reported $T_0\sigma$ for COT tracks (Blue = positively charged tracks and Red = negatively charged tracks) and (RHS) RMS of the t_0 of the tracks used in the vertex distributions. The track $T_0\sigma$ as well as the RMS of the tracks around the mean of the best fit vertex allow us to infer the intrinsic uncertainty of the timing measurement associated with the tracks and allow us to infer the necessary sensitivity of the calibrations of the track times. 86
- 3.5 The COT track t_0 for positive (blue) and negative charges (red) in the top row and the mean time of the COT tracks, $\langle t_0 \rangle$, plotted as a function of various variables before calibrations. Note the scale on the y-axis in some of the plots is much larger than others. 90
- 3.6 The electron track t_0 , and mean t_0 as a function of RunNumber η and ϕ variables before calibrations. 91
- 3.7 The COT track t_0 after calibrations for positive (blue) and negative charges (red) in the top row and the mean time of the COT tracks, $\langle t_0 \rangle$, plotted as a function of various variables. Note the scale on the y-axis is now $\pm 500 \text{ ps}$ 94

FIGURE

Page

3.8	The electron track t_0 , and $\langle t_0 \rangle$ as a function of RunNumber η and ϕ variables after calibrations. Note the variations are small here compared to the variations in Figure 3.6.	95
3.9	The SpaceTime vertex t_0 as well as $\langle t_0 \rangle$ plotted versus various variables after track calibrations, but before vertex calibrations. This demonstrates that even following the COT track calibrations there is still a systematic offset of the mean time on the order of 55 ps, thus necessitating a simple calibration subtraction. The slope in the bottom figure of $\langle t_0 \rangle$ vs. z is expected and described in detail in Reference [66].	96
3.10	The SpaceTime variables after calibrations showing that the vertexing is well calibrated. The slope in the bottom figure of mean $\langle t_0 \rangle$ vs. z is expected and described in detail in Reference [66].	98
3.11	(Top) The ΔT and (Bottom) ΔZ and $\langle \Delta T \rangle$ and $\langle \Delta Z \rangle$ vs Run Number between the electron track and the SpaceTime vertex demonstrating that the track and vertex calibrations have removed any bias between the electron track and the SpaceTime vertex.	99
3.12	The $\langle t_{corr} \rangle$ distributions before EMTiming calibrations used to generate the run-by-run, tower, and energy calibrations.	101
3.13	The distribution of t_{corr} after the full set of calibrations for the $W \rightarrow e\nu$ sample. We note that the distributions have a mean of 0.002 ns and and RMS of 0.69 ns, which is well within the nominal expectations of having a mean of 0.0 ns and an RMS of 0.65 ns. We also see that distribution of $\langle t_{corr} \rangle$ is flat and centered as a function of run number, energy, vertex ΣP_T , η , ϕ , vertex z , and number of vertices in the event.	104
3.14	EMTiming variables, t_{corr}^0 , after calibrations. Note that this variable is just the t_f where we have subtracted the average t_0 for all collisions and the average TOF for this tower.	105
3.15	The time-of-flight from the right vertex as a function of energy and tower after calibrations for the $W \rightarrow e\nu$ sample. The evidence of variation in this variable gives us an understanding of why calibrating versus t_{corr}^0 does not take into account the effect due to detector and reconstruction properties of the sample of events.	106

FIGURE

Page

4.1	(Top) Cartoon schematic of how an incoming cosmic ray can interact with the atmosphere and create a cascade of particles which, if they originate with enough energy, can reach the surface of the Earth and appear in our detector. Taken from Reference [79]. (Bottom) Schematic view of how a cosmic ray can create a $\gamma+E_T$ candidate event if it produces a fake photon in the detector that arrives in coincidence with a collision.	109
4.2	(Top) Schematic of the timing distribution of cosmic ray events present in photon data. The timing distribution is roughly flat over time allowing us to estimate the rate of cosmics in the signal region by measuring it in the region $20 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < 80 \text{ ns}$. (Bottom) Timing distribution of of our cosmic ray presample selected from photon data, using Table 4.1 and the inversion of the cuts in Table 4.2 and 4.3. The timing distribution is roughly flat over time allowing us to estimate the rate of cosmics in the signal region from data.	113
4.3	Schematic view of how beam halo can create fake photons in the detector if they happen to arrive in coincidence with a collision.	114
4.4	Timing distribution of beam halo events selected from photon data by applying the non-collision presample, defined in Table 4.1, as well as applying the cosmic ray vetos, defined in Table 4.2, and inverting the beam halo veto, defined in Table 4.3. We note that when we invert the vetos defined in Table 4.3 we explicitly require the candidate photon to have $\text{seedWedge} > 8$ and $\text{NHadPlug} > 2$. Here you can see the structure in the timing distribution created during the coalescing of the proton-antiproton bunches.	116
4.5	Plot of beam intensity output as measured by the Main Injector resistive wall detector (as described in Reference [47]) for the Tevatron proton and satellite bunches, taken from [81]. This shows that the satellite bunches both proceed and follow the main bunch by tens of nanoseconds with approximately one percent the intensity of the main bunch.	118
4.6	Monte Carlo simulation of the t_{corr}^0 distribution for beam-beam, beam-satellite, and satellite-satellite bunch collisions.	119

- 4.7 Timing distribution of events selected to look for the presence of satellite bunches in data. We construct the t_{corr}^0 distribution since there is no vertex reconstructed in the event. We estimate the cosmics rate from the cosmics region ($20 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < 80 \text{ ns}$) and subtract this off. We note that there is no evidence for satellite bunch interactions being a significant source of backgrounds and thus we do not apply any specific method to reject against them. Note, there is some evidence for beam halo sources with events below -5 ns and a peak at 15 ns. 120
- 5.1 The t_{corr} distribution using the $e+\cancel{E}_T$ calibration data (defined in Table 3.1) using the highest ΣP_T vertex (top) as well as the right and wrong vertex Gaussians using the matching of the electron track to the vertex (bottom) verifying the description of the timing distribution as being well described by a double Gaussian distribution of two well understood and separate contributions. 124
- 5.2 A schematic drawing of a $W \rightarrow e\nu \rightarrow \gamma_{fake} + \cancel{E}_T$ where we have selected a wrong vertex. For this example, the selection of the wrong vertex leads to an $\theta_{Measured} > \theta_{True}$ where θ_{True} is the real angle the photon/electron came from. This results in a larger measured value for E_T ($E_T^{Measured} > E_T^{True}$), thus preferentially causing us to select these events. Furthermore, the path length calculated for the wrong vertex is shorter than the true path length of the photon/electron resulting in an apparent longer time of flight and thus $t_{corr}^{Measured} > t_{corr}^{True}$ causing an overall shift in the mean. 134
- 5.3 The E_T^{True} distribution for a sample of $W \rightarrow e\nu$ MC events selected with Table 5.3 that make it into the exclusive $\gamma + \cancel{E}_T$ presample but with two different E_T requirements. The unshaded histogram is the true E_T for electrons that fake photons with $E_T^{True} > 25 \text{ GeV}$ while the solid histogram (shown in green) is the E_T^{True} for electrons that were identified as photons, and passed the $E_T^{Measured} > 45 \text{ GeV}$ cut. Events both entering the sample (green events below the dashed line) and the events leaving the sample (area under the open histogram but above the green, to the right of the dashed line) bias the measurement of t_{corr}^{WV} since large time events enter the sample and low time events leave the sample. 136

- 5.4 The t_{corr} timing distribution for the $e+\cancel{E}_T$ presamples described in Table 5.2 from data (Top Row) and $W \rightarrow e\nu$ MC (Bottom Row) when the events are selected using $E_T^{Measured} > 45$ GeV (LHS) and using $E_T^0 > 45$ GeV (RHS). This shows that you can reduce the value of $\langle t_{corr}^{WV} \rangle$ by simply calculating E_T and \cancel{E}_T from $z = 0$. Note that data and MC give very similar results showing that this effect is well understood. 138
- 5.5 (Top-LHS) A schematic representation of an electron interacting with the detector material and having a hard bremsstrahlung interaction. After the interaction the electron curves off because of its resulting lower energy and thus its trajectory becomes highly curved in the magnetic field and is no longer associated with the photon using the standard photon identification algorithms. It is important to note that both before and after the bremsstrahlung the trajectory can be reconstructed as a single low P_T track. (Top-RHS) The true path length for electrons mis-identified as photons, selected with Table 5.3 for the exclusive $\gamma+\cancel{E}_T$ presample, showing that these events tend to have larger path lengths than correctly identified electrons. (Bottom) The ΔTOF between the true vertex and $z = 0$ cm for the same sample of events demonstrating that events from electrons mis-identified as photons will have a larger bias. 139
- 5.6 Two different plots showing where, inside the detector, an electron interacts with the detector and loses more than half of its energy to a photon that is ultimately identified as passing all the photon ID requirements in Table 2.8. In the top plot we see a 2-D histogram showing the location in the radius vs. the z position along the beamline. The bottom shows an integral plot of the fraction of events which converted within the detector. Both indicate that the majority of events are seen to brems inside the silicon detector and the port cards (denoted with the dashed lines). 141
- 5.7 To help reject electrons that fake photons, we have measured the angular separation between the photon and the closest track direction normalized to these measurement resolutions for our control sample of $\gamma+\cancel{E}_T$ events from $W \rightarrow e\nu$ MC with the added requirement that the photon come directly from an electron. The top plot shows the correlation between $\Delta\eta_{Pull}$ and $\Delta\phi_{Pull}$. The bottom plot shows a comparison of the ΔR_{pull} for our presample, along with a second $\gamma+\cancel{E}_T$ control sample from $Z\gamma \rightarrow \nu\nu\gamma$ MC showing the rejection power of this cut. Note, both samples are normalized unit area. 144

- 5.8 This plot show the rejection of a electron rejection cut on ΔR_{pull} as a function of the efficiency. As the cut gets tighter the rejection gets worse but the efficiency goes up. A cut at $\Delta R_{pull} = 5$ (red dashed line) results in approximately 93% efficiency of MC $Z\gamma \rightarrow \nu\nu\gamma \rightarrow \gamma + \cancel{E}_T$ and 75% rejection of $e \rightarrow \gamma_{fake}$ 145
- 5.9 The timing distribution for the $\gamma + \cancel{E}_T$ presample from $W \rightarrow e\nu$ MC before (top) and after (bottom) the ΔR_{pull} cut. The application of this cut does not reduce the wrong vertex timing bias but does reduce the overall rate at which this background appears in our final sample. 146
- 5.10 The z distribution of the true collision position for a MC sample of $\gamma + \text{Jet}$ events selected using Table 5.3 which defines the $\gamma + \cancel{E}_T$ presample. This distribution shows many events which originate at $|z| > 60$ cm. 147
- 5.11 The timing distribution for the $\gamma + \cancel{E}_T$ presample from $\gamma + \text{Jet}$ MC events (Top) and the same sample after applying the large z veto (Bottom) showing the wrong vertex mean becomes much less biased. 148
- 5.12 The timing distribution for the $\gamma + \cancel{E}_T$ presample from from $Z\gamma \rightarrow \nu\nu\gamma$ MC events (Top) and the same sample after applying the large z veto (Bottom) showing very little effect in the timing distribution for events which originate from within $|z| < 60$ cm. 149
- 5.13 The timing distribution for cosmic ray events selected using $\gamma + \cancel{E}_T$ data presample using the requirements in Table 5.3 but adding the restriction of the timing region from $20 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < 80 \text{ ns}$. The left and right plots show the timing distribution before and after the large z veto the rate of cosmic rays is effectively not effected, as expected, by the large z veto . . 150
- 5.14 The timing distributions for the $W \rightarrow e\nu$, $\gamma + \text{Jet}$, $Z\gamma$, $W \rightarrow \mu\nu$, $W \rightarrow \tau\nu$, and $W\gamma$ MC control samples and the $e + \cancel{E}_T$ control samples. The distributions are well fit by a double Gaussian distribution. In this fit the right vertex (blue) Gaussian is fixed with a mean =0.0 ns and a RMS =0.65 ns and the wrong vertex (red) Gaussian RMS is fixed =2.0 ns while the mean and normalization are allowed to vary. 152

FIGURE

Page

- 5.15 The measured mean RMS of the wrong vertex versus the mean of the wrong vertex timing distribution, $\langle t_{corr}^{WV} \rangle$ where we have allowed both the mean and the RMS to vary in the fit for our six MC $\gamma+/\cancel{E}_T$ and two $e+/\cancel{E}_T$ data control samples. The results show that the description that the wrong vertex distribution is well modeled by a Gaussian with an RMS of 2.0 ± 0.1 ns. 154
- 6.1 Ratio of the number of events observed in the signal region ($2 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < 7 \text{ ns}$) to the number of event observed in the control region ($-7 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < 2 \text{ ns}$) versus the measured wrong vertex mean for our eight control samples. The black line is not a fit, but rather is the prediction from the double Gaussian assumption where the right vertex distribution is fixed and the wrong vertex mean is allowed to vary. It does an excellent job of predicting the numer of events in the signal region. Note that in this figure we have measured $\langle t_{corr}^{WV} \rangle$ from a full fit of the control sample (see Figure 5.14), which we cannot do directly in the real data. 158
- 6.2 This figure shows the creation of a $\gamma+/\cancel{E}_T$ event where the primary collision does not produce a reconstructed vertex. We use a sample of events with this topology because their timing distribution, t_{corr}^0 , is dominated by the topology of the SM events where the wrong vertex is selected. If no good SpaceTime vertex is reconstructed, but the event passes all the other exclusive $\gamma+/\cancel{E}_T$ event selection requirements there is a clear relationship between $\langle t_{corr}^0 \rangle$ and $\langle t_{corr}^{WV} \rangle$ 160
- 6.3 (LHS) An illustration showing the various components of the time-of-flight components of the t_{corr}^{WV} coming from the difference relative to the center of the detector (TOF_0) and the time-of-flight difference relative to a wrong vertex (TOF_{WV}). (RHS) The results of pseudo-experiments where verticies are generated according to the z and t parameters of the Tevatron and we calculate the time-of-flight of the wrong vertex, TOF_{WV} , and the time-of-flight for the no vertex, TOF_0 demonstrating that $\langle TOF_0 - TOF_{WV} \rangle = 0$ to less than 40 ps. 162
- 6.4 The t_{corr}^0 distribution for the no vertex samples from the six MC control samples as well as the two control $e+/\cancel{E}_T$ sample from data. The fit is for a Gaussian fit from $-5 \text{ ns} < t_{corr}^0 < 3 \text{ ns}$ with a fixed RMS = 1.6 ns in order to estimate to measure $\langle t_{corr}^0 \rangle$ which is a good estimate of $\langle t_{corr}^{WV} \rangle$. . . 164

- 6.5 A plot showing the relationship between the RMS of the t_{corr}^0 distribution for no vertex events versus $\langle t_{corr}^0 \rangle$ for our MC and e+Met data control samples. This demonstrates that the assumption that the no vertex corrected time distribution is well modeled by a Gaussian with an RMS of 1.6 ± 0.08 ns for the various MC backgrounds in addition to e+ \cancel{E}_T data samples is a good one. The no vertex mean and RMS is found by fitting the no vertex corrected time (t_{corr}^0) distribution with a single Gaussian from $-5 \text{ ns} < t_{corr}^0 < 3 \text{ ns}$ where the Gaussian RMS and mean are allowed to vary to find the best fit. 165
- 6.6 The correlation between $\langle t_{corr}^{WV} \rangle$ and $\langle t_{corr}^0 \rangle$ for our MC and e+ \cancel{E}_T data control samples. One method is taken from Table 5.6 and is where we measure the WV directly from a full fit to the data, which is only possible in MC, and one from the no-vertex sample which is available in data. Note that the two agree to a high degree of precision. This fact allows us to predict the wrong vertex mean for a given sample by measuring a sample of events that pass all the other selection requirements but fail to reconstruct a vertex. 167
- 6.7 The ratio of the number of events observed in the signal region ($2 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < 7 \text{ ns}$) to the number of event observed in the control region ($-7 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < -2 \text{ ns}$) versus the observed “no vertex” mean for the eight MC and data control samples. This shows that using the double Gaussian assumption and measuring the mean of the “no vertex” distribution we can accurately predict the number of events in the signal region for all our control samples within uncertainties. 169
- 7.1 The t_{corr} distribution for the final $\gamma + \cancel{E}_T$ dataset. In this plot we highlight the cosmics region, $20 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < 80 \text{ ns}$, and use this to estimate the cosmic ray rate in the signal region $2 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < 7 \text{ ns}$ as well as our control region as part of the background estimate procedure. 174
- 7.2 (Top) The t_{corr}^0 distribution for the no vertex sample. Note that the straight line fit is performed in the cosmics region $20 \text{ ns} < t_{corr}^0 < 80 \text{ ns}$ and for the collision distribution a Gaussian is fit from $-5 \text{ ns} < t_{corr}^0 < 3 \text{ ns}$ with the RMS fixed to 1.6 ns while the mean of the Gaussian is allowed to vary in order to determine the best fit mean. (Bottom) Taking the $\pm 1\sigma$ systematic variation of the mean from the no vertex corrected time showing that $\langle t_{corr}^0 \rangle = 0.12 \pm 0.17 \text{ ns}$ well describes the distribution. . . 175

FIGURE

Page

- 7.3 (Top) The t_{corr} distribution of the $6.3 \text{ fb}^{-1} \gamma + \cancel{E}_T$ data showing the right, wrong vertex, and cosmics prediction. (Bottom) Taking the $\pm 1\sigma$ systematic variation of the mean of the wrong vertex showing that $\langle t_{corr}^{WV} \rangle = 0.12 \pm 0.20 \text{ ns}$ well describes the background distribution outside the signal region. 179
- 7.4 The data minus background plot for the t_{corr} distribution where the yellow and green represent the $\pm 1\sigma$ and 2σ variation of the systematic and the error bars representing statistical error on the data. The events in the signal region correspond to a 1.65σ excess taking into account all the statistical and systematic uncertainties. 180
- 7.5 The t_{corr} distribution for the exclusive $\gamma + \cancel{E}_T$ events that pass all the selection requirements in Table 5.5 but fail the large $|z|$ veto and where no $e \rightarrow \gamma_{fake}$ veto is applied and we require a good SpaceTime vertex. These events have a clear bias to large t_{corr} times with 78 events between $2 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < 7 \text{ ns}$ and 48 events between $-7 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < -2 \text{ ns}$ and thus contributed to the excess seen in the preliminary study done in 2008. . . 187
- 7.6 The t_{corr} distribution for the exclusive $\gamma + \cancel{E}_T$ events that pass all the selection requirements in Table 5.5 but fail the ΔR_{Pull} veto. These events, likely coming from $W \rightarrow e\nu \rightarrow \gamma_{fake} + \cancel{E}_T$, have a clear bias to large t_{corr} times with 53 events between $2 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < 7 \text{ ns}$ and 26 events between $-7 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < -2 \text{ ns}$ and thus contributed to the excess seen in the preliminary study done in 2008. 188
- 7.7 The t_{corr} distribution for the final exclusive $\gamma + \cancel{E}_T$ but where we assume $\langle t_{corr}^{WV} \rangle = 0 \text{ ns}$ in the background estimate. This is to be compared to Figure 7.3 where we find $\langle t_{corr}^{WV} \rangle = 0.12 \pm 0.20 \text{ ns}$ from our data-driven background estimation. This illustrates how this assumption can lead to the errant conclusion of an excess number of events in the signal region ($2 \text{ ns} < t_{corr} < 7 \text{ ns}$). 189
- B.1 Schematic view of the CDF detector where the muon detection system is highlighted in green. These muon detectors allow us to distinguish cosmic rays which originate outside the detector and pass through the muon detectors and may be incorrectly identified as a photon. 214

FIGURE

Page

- B.2 The distribution of the modified version of $HAD(E)$, taking into account the photon candidate energy, for electrons coming from collisions using selection requirements in Table 3.1 (black line) as well as the hadronic energy distribution coming from cosmic ray photons using the selection requirements in Table 4.1 (pink line) and reversing the muon-stub veto in Table 4.2. We note that high energy objects coming from the collision deposit more energy in the hadronic calorimeter than minimum ionizing events like cosmic rays. The dashed line shows our requirement. 216
- B.3 This plot shows a comparison of $\frac{CES(E)}{TotalE}$ for cosmic ray photons identified (pink line) using the selection requirements in Tables 4.1 and 4.2 and (black line) electrons using Table 3.1. We note that high energy objects coming from the collision deposit a larger fraction of their energy in the CES detector than photon candidates from cosmic ray sources do. 218
- B.4 Rejection versus efficiency curve for the combination of the $Had(E)$ cut and the CES energy fraction taken together resulting in a 92% efficiency for a 76% rejection of cosmic ray photons. 218